

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-29 were pending and rejected. In this response, no claim has been canceled. Claims 1, 5, 11, 15, 21, 26 and 28 have been amended. In addition, new claims 30-50 have been added. Thus, claims 1-50 remain pending. No new matter has been added.

Claim 17 is objected to because of informalities. In view of foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that the objection has been overcome.

Claims 1-10 and 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,647,512 of James et al. ("James"). Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over James in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,038,689 of Schmidt et al. ("Schmidt"). In view of foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-50 include limitations that are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Specifically, independent claim 1 as amended recites as follows:

1. An apparatus, comprising:  
a first register to store default configuration data;  
a second register coupled to the first register to store active configuration data;  
an input circuit coupled to the second register to receive input data different than the default configuration data to be programmed into the second register; and  
control logic coupled to the first register, the second register, and the input circuit to load the second register with data selected from either the default configuration data from the first register or input data from the input circuit.

(Emphasis added)

Independent claim 1 includes a first register for storing default configuration data and a second register to store active configuration data either from the first register (e.g., the

default configuration data), or alternatively, from an input circuit (customized configuration data), which is different from the default configuration data. A system then may be configured in accordance with the configuration data stored in the second register, which could be default or customized. It is respectfully submitted that the above limitations are absent from the cited references, individually or in combination.

Rather, James is related to loading the configuration data from the BIOS memory into CMOS memory, where the configuration data is executed from the CMOS memory. See, for example, col. 5, lines 4 to 22 of James). That is, every time when the system reboots, the configuration data is loaded from the BIOS into the CMOS to be executed. There is no disclosure or suggestion within James that control logic determines whether the configuration data should be loaded from the default configuration data or from the customized configuration data that is different from the default configuration data.

In addition, even if the CMOS of James were considered as the second register, the data loaded into the CMOS appears to be the same from the BIOS memory, rather than different configuration data received from a separate input circuit as claimed in the present invention.

Furthermore, as claimed in claims 2, 12, and 26, etc., the configuration data stored in the second register may be retainable dependent upon the type of reset operations. In contrast, the content of the CMOS of James will be lost when the system reboots and the configuration data has to be reloaded from the BIOS.

Schmidt is related to fault notification system using a local area network. It is respectfully submitted that Schmidt also fails to disclose or suggest the limitations set forth above.

James does not suggest combining with Schmidt and Schmidt does not suggest combining with James. Again, James is related to restoring CMOS data in a data processing system while Schmidt is related to fault notification within a LAN. James and Schmidt are solving significantly different problems and their approaches are significantly different. It is respectfully submitted that one with ordinary skill in the art, based on the teachings of James and Schmidt, would not combine these two references.

Even if they were combined, such a combination still lacks the limitations set forth above. Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is patentable over James in view of Schmidt.

Similarly, independent claims 11 and 21 include limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Thus, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, independent claims 11 and 21 are patentable over James in view of Schmidt.

Given that dependent claims 2-10, 12-20, and 22-50 depend from one of the above independent claims, at least for the reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-10, 12-20, and 22-50 are patentable over James in view of Schmidt.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection  
with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 7/13/2004



Kevin G. Shao  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 45,095

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300